DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 850 HE 017 736

AUTHOR	Brown, Peggy Ann, Ed.
TITLE	Writing Programs.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($3.25).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Forum for Liberal Education v7 n1 Oct 1984
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College English; *College Programs; Degree Requirements; *English Departments; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Descriptions; Rhetorical Criticism; *Writing Instruction; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Albright College PA; Eastern Oregon State College; Ithaca College NY; Kalamazoo College MI; Moravian College PA; Orange Coast College CA; Pima Community College AZ; Saint Mary of the Woods College IN; Saint Marys College IN; Southeastern Massachusetts University; Towson State University MD; University of Chicago IL; University of Massachusetts Amherst; University of Pennsylvania; University of Wisconsin Madison

ABSTRACT

Ways that colleges and universities provide opportunities for students to improve their writing are discussed in two essays and program descriptions. In "Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition: Finding Ways to Revalue Writing," Patrick Hartwell and Greg Waters briefly describe activities at colleges that center around the rhetorical tradition, and specifically the value on writing as a mode of learning. The second article, "Comprehensive Writing Programs: Keeping Them Going," by Elaine P. Maimon offers seven suggestions for keeping comprehensive writing programs healthy and successful. The descriptions of college writing programs include the following topics: freshmen writing courses, a nondegree writing program separate from the English department, a requirement that undergraduates complete one upper-level writing course, and a Writing Across the University Program. Writing programs at the following universities are described: University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Ithaca College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Towson State University, University of Pennsylvania, Albright College, the University of Chicago, Eastern Oregon State College, Kalamazoo College, Moravian College, Orange Coast College, Pima Community College, Saint Mary's College, Southeastern Massachusetts University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. A 27-item annotated bibliography is included. (SW)

ED249850

The forum FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

VOL. 7, NO. 1 OCTOBER 1984

Writing Programs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 017 236

aac

Association of American Colleges

The forum
FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

October 1984
Volume 7, Number 1

Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition: Finding Ways to Revalue Writing
by Patrick Hartwell and Greg Waters 2

Comprehensive Writing Programs: Keeping Them Going
by Elaine P. Maimon . . . 4

University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Attention All Students: Writing is Important . . . 5

Ithaca College
Advising Students to Write 7

St. Mary-of-the-Woods College
Campus Commitment to Communication Curriculum 8

Towson State University
Refining Students' Writing Skills 9

University of Pennsylvania
Writing for Excellence . . . 11

Additional Programs 12

Resources 18

Editor: Peggy Ann Brown

Editorial Assistant: Nancy Musorafite

Contributing Writers: Steve Howard, Thomas Prugh

Cover illustration by Amelia Bellows.

Published six times during the academic year by the Association of American Colleges. *Forum* is available for $18 per academic year for persons at AAC member institutions and $24 for all others. Multiple copy rates available. ISSN 0734-9793.

©1984 by the Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St. N.W., Washington, DC 20009. 202/387-3760.

Improving Students' Writing

Liberal arts programs often list "good communication skills" as one attribute of their liberally-educated graduates. Students who have mastered the arts of written and oral communication are valued commodities in the job market. But, unfortunately, not every liberal arts major can claim these abilities. Refining skills takes practice, and some programs do not allow for this practice in their courses. This issue examines the different ways colleges and universities provide opportunities for students to improve their writing.

Attention to writing is, of course, more than a ticket to plenty of job offers. Again and again the people we interviewed for this issue stressed the importance of writing as a mode of learning. They and their colleagues are thrilled (and sometimes surprised) at how much better students understand a subject after they have had frequent opportunities to write about it. In the lead essay, Patrick Hartwell and Greg Waters claim this response signals a return to the rhetorical tradition that once formed the curriculum's core.

Many of the programs described here employ a cross-disciplinary approach that blends writing practice with courses outside the English department. They supplement activities presented in the April 1981 *Forum* issue which detailed a number of pioneering "writing across the curriculum" efforts. Elaine Maimon, a ten-year veteran of this approach, offers suggestions for keeping comprehensive writing programs healthy and successful.

P.A.B.

Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition: Finding Ways to Revalue Writing

by Patrick Hartwell, Professor of English
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
and
Greg Waters, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Montclair State College

On college campuses around the country, faculty members and administrators have responded to the newspaper stories about declining SAT scores and rising rates of illiteracy among high school graduates by restoring writing to its proper place at the center of the liberal arts. The movement goes by a number of names—"writing across the curriculum," "a process approach to writing"—but it is most properly seen as a reinvention of the rhetorical tradition that dominated western education until the middle of the last century. (Thus the word *rhetoric*, now used to suggest "bloated or ineffective communication" in the popular press, has a

deeper meaning, "the art of effective communication.")

English departments, which for a generation had been molding themselves as "departments of literature" intent on producing literary critics with no commitment to language as a social force, are finding rhetoric to be fashionable again. More than 20 English departments have started doctoral programs in rhetoric and the teaching of writing, and young Ph.D.s are now being trained in a discipline that is as venerable as the idea of university education itself.

Historically, rhetoric—the art of effective oral and written communication—stood at the center of Greek and then Roman education, and it translated into the core of medieval universities the "trivium" of rhetoric, grammar, and logic. This tradition can be overemphasized—"trivium" is, after all, the source of our modern word *trivial*—and it can be misunderstood ("grammar" in medieval universities meant the study of literature, broadly conceived rather than the dreary parsing exercises of current textbooks). But there are signs, everywhere around us, that in English departments and across the curriculum we are reinventing the rhetorical tradition, that we are placing a renewed value on writing as a mode of learning. In addition to the programs described in this issue of *Forum*, the following activities are noteworthy:

• At the **University of California–Berkeley**, the Bay Area Writing Project, convinced that the best teachers of writing are themselves writers, has grown, with NEH funding, into the National Writing Project, supporting 100 regional associations of college and public school teachers in 43 states.

• At the **University of Michigan**, a university-wide faculty committee certifies courses in the various academic disciplines as "writing courses," and each student must take at least three such courses.

• At the **University of Texas–Austin**, students are now required to take a junior-level writing course, with the sections focusing on the respective methods of inquiry and communication characteristic of the arts, the natural sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences.

• In England, the government-sponsored "Bullock Report," *A Language for Life*, stresses the centrality of language in the learning process and calls for greater emphasis on training teachers in the functional use of language.

• At the **University of California–Los Angeles**, the provost sponsors a colloquim on writing across the curriculum, and more than 100 faculty members from across the disciplines show up for the voluntary Saturday session.

• At the **University of Pennsylvania**, anthropologist Dell E. Hymes accepts the deanship of the College of Education and, supported with NIE funding, initiates a broad inquiry into the uses of literacy in inner cities, observing reading and writing in homes, stores, and churches. Similar inquiries into the contexts of literacy are being conducted at Stanford, Indiana-Bloomington, and the University of California–Berkeley.

Small schools as well as large, technical colleges as well as liberal arts colleges, are exploring new ways to emphasize writing as an interdisciplinary subject with implications for all forms of inquiry.

• At **Montclair State College**, faculty members have developed campus-wide "Standards for Written Work" for courses across the curriculum, and departments are ensuring that students satisfy special requirements in writing before graduation.

But there are signs, everywhere around us... that we are reinventing the rhetorical tradition, that we are placing a renewed value on writing as a mode of learning.

• At **Carnegie Mellon University**, a Document Design Center, established as a joint venture of writing specialists and cognitive psychologists, explores ways to improve the readability and design clarity of public documents. (The Carnegie Mellon Ph.D. program in rhetoric, like that of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, trains candidates for positions in business, industry, and government as well as for teaching positions.)

• At **Indiana University of Pennsylvania**, graduate and undergraduate students are awarded "certificates of excellence in writing," as a cooperative project of the English Department and the sponsoring department.

• At the University of Michigan–Flint, the City University of New York, and elsewhere, peer-staffed Writing Centers provide instruction in developmental reading and writing while serving also as community resources for teachers in public schools and private academies.

• Many colleges and universities now flag certain writing sections with the prerequisite, "must have typing skills," teaching the sections using word processors equipped with programs to help students generate ideas and revise texts.

Such activities reflect two growing recognitions: that writing is, in itself, a mode of learning, and that language, broadly conceived, is at the center of the learning process, the medium through which we articulate our concerns with each other. The first recognition has led professors in various disciplines to place less emphasis on "writing to teacher as examiner" and more emphasis on "writing to learn." For example, experiments in fields as diverse as music and mathematics have shown that asking students to keep informal journals enhances their

learning. The second recognition has led many professors to allow small-group peer discussions in content-area courses, letting students—who normally receive information passively, through lectures and readings—talk in the language of a discipline as a way into writing in that discipline.

Research Stirs Interest in Writing

The sources of this new interest in writing are manifold, dictated in part, of course, by public pressures, but stimulated more by a growing body of cross-disciplinary research, even by our gradual rediscovery of the centrality of rhetoric in earlier generations. (Perhaps the most stunning of the latter is a monograph by James L. Kinneavy of the University of Texas–Austin to be published by Oxford University Press, arguing that the Christian concept of *faith*, of belief freely given, has its origin in the Greek rhetorical concept of *persuasion*.) At last, we are recognizing that writing ability is not a series of discrete skills to be isolated and taught through drill and rote memory, but a complex and holistic skill, deeply engrained in the process of learning. Thus, the California State Board of Education has mandated that teachers of all subjects, at all grade levels, be trained to understand the writing process and its importance for learning, and Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine, in their groundbreaking Carnegie Foundation essay about the aims of general education, "A Quest for Common Learning," suggest that the mere development of skills is not sufficient. They argue that students need, as part of their general education, to understand "why and how language has evolved, how messages reveal the values of a culture, how words and thoughts interact, and how feelings and ideas are conveyed."

The traditional freshman composition course—a graduation requirement in eight of every ten colleges and universities—had for too long been disvalued in the curriculum, seen as a narrow skills-centered course and shunted off to graduate teaching assistants and part-timers. To resee this course as a broadly humanistic inquiry, at the core of what it is to be an educated adult, is not only to respond to the best of current research about writing and knowing; it is also to reinvent a 2,400 year-old tradition that once stood proudly at the center of the curriculum.

Comprehensive Writing Programs: Keeping Them Going

by Elaine P. Maimon
Associate Vice President and
Professor of English, Beaver College

For the April 1981 *Forum* issue Harvey Wiener and I called upon members of the Council of Writing Program Administrators to send descriptions of writing programs transcending a single department or discipline and reaching out to enhance liberal learning. From the stack of material that arrived we selected nine programs to feature and ten additional ones to describe in lesser detail. Since 1981, many new comprehensive writing programs have been well launched. Writing across the curriculum is in vogue. Nearly every institution, large or small, public or private, wants to try something that will extend responsibility for writing beyond a single department. But will such programs last? Is writing across the curriculum a fad, or is it a means for revitalizing liberal learning and for making profound and longstanding changes in an institution?

As with all such questions, the answer is, "It depends." The most important variable is the intellectual consistency of the philosophy underlying the program. If writing across the curriculum is defined mechanically and quantitatively by the number of pages assigned in given courses, then the program will be short-lived. If writing is defined narrowly, strictly in terms of its surface features—conventions of punctuation and standard usage—then the program will quickly lose momentum.

Since the program which I direct at Beaver College is completing its first decade, I welcome this opportunity to reflect on principles that lead to changes beyond the superficial:

1. Curriculum change, in writing or in anything else, should be based on scholarly exchange among faculty members. Writing programs that result from administrative fiat will quickly founder because everyone in the institution will hold a different concept of what writing is. The programs that I have seen fail are the ones that have become programs too soon before faculty members had any chance to explore current scholarship on writing as process. Ugly debate motivated by departmental territoriality can be short-circuited when faculty members exchange views on intellectual rather than political positions.

The most beneficial format for faculty conversation is the faculty workshop led by an outsider, who provides scholarly expertise but more important keeps everyone polite. Workshops have been successful at many liberal arts colleges including prestigious ones like Smith and Wellesley because the focus on writing makes possible a special communal exchange. The workshop, because it is not a postdoctoral seminar, or a committee meeting, or a party, provides a setting for substantive discussions of creative teaching. When faculty members in different disciplines exchange views on the same student paper, they move quickly into fascinating discussions of the nature of evidence in various fields. When faculty members write and exchange drafts with colleagues, they remember to see themselves and their students as writers.

Large universities have experienced some difficulties in gathering senior faculty members for workshops. Yale and the University of Pennsylvania have focused on graduate students in various disciplines as the harbingers of change. Both programs have been successful in preparing these apprentices to occupy a middle-ground in the academic conversation, explaining concepts of writing as process to the senior professors to whom they report, incorporating drafts, conferences and learning groups in the courses which they teach. Stanford University, however, has accomplished the almost impossible by gathering this September a group of twenty senior faculty members in fields ranging from classics to chemistry for a two-day workshop on the teaching of writing.

2. Writing is not a problem but an opportunity. If workshops or graduate student emissaries are success-

ful, faculty members will begin to see that writing across the curriculum is not a ploy to make everyone into an English teacher. Writing is education made visible. Learning in every field from philosophy to forestry can be enhanced by the integration of writing activities, often upgraded, into the continuing process of learning. The comprehensive writing programs that endure are those in which instructors in nursing, business administration, and physical therapy find that writing activities lead to better understanding of substantive concepts in their courses. Just as the writing workshop for faculty members provides a special opportunity for cross-disciplinary conversation, so the short, focused writing task in the classroom provides an occasion for enhanced concentration and learning. Writing as a way of learning, not just as a way of testing, informs those comprehensive writing programs that endure.

If writing across the curriculum is defined mechanically and quantitatively by the number of pages assigned in given courses, then the program will be short-lived.

---

3. Pedagogic procedures should be broad enough to accommodate writing as a means of learning and writing as a means of public statement. A program that insists dogmatically on a private journal in every course will be in as much trouble as the program that requires grading of all student work. In programs that have longevity instructors work out a variety of assignments that are in accord with the goals of the course. Some of these assignments are ungraded prompts to understanding and creativity. Some are sequentially designed activities to help students speak, without embarrassment, in the public voice of a discipline. A viable program does not permit sound theory to calcify into dogma. The journal, the learning group, the draft, the acknowledgments page are all outward signs of a program based on current scholarship, but they are not indisputable signs of inner grace.

4. Remember the difference between a small sailing craft and an ocean liner. All sailors must learn principles of oceanography, just as leaders of comprehensive writing programs must be familiar with concepts in composition theory. But different ships necessitate different tactics. Curriculum leaders must fathom the history and culture of their own institutions. The "Beaver College model" for administering a program may not work at all at the University of Pennsylvania, although both programs may be anchored in the same intellectual principles.

5. Employ all available means to weave the writing program into the fabric of the institution. Get references to the program into the minutes of important committees (including the Board of Trustees), the catalog, and even the by-laws.

6. Make long-range plans for the financial support of the program. Begin with a modest shopping list, enough for an outside consultant to lead a workshop for a single day. Many institutions, even those on the poverty line, have some funds available for an opening convocation. But think ahead to costs of the program in the long run. Because of media attention, alumni are frequently ready to help with donations for writing workshops. Most comprehensive writing programs, those that help the standing faculty to rethink the place of writing in their courses, need not be expensive. Those programs that depend on graduate students, readily available but transient, cost a great deal more. Yale solved that problem by finding donors to endow its comprehensive writing program, now designated the Bass Writing Program. Yale's example may be useful to others involved in long-range fundraising. The key point is for curriculum planners to work closely with development officers.

7. Involve new faculty members and keep the ideas fresh for veterans. As the euphoria of the first set of workshops diminishes, plan a second set, not focussed on writing, but on critical thinking, action learning, or even on the core curriculum. All of these issues, important in themselves, involve writing without wearing the subject out. Make sure that new faculty members join veterans on the writing committee, and arrange for the educational policy committee or the faculty as a whole to ask for frequent reports.

A commitment to writing across the curriculum can revitalize a campus if faculty members and administrators understand that in the long-run writing is interesting because it helps us to understand thinking, that silent, invisible activity that is the only comprehensive program for liberal learning.

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Attention All Students: Writing Is Important

"Writing is an activity, not a subject," declares English Professor Charles Moran in his syllabus for College Writing, the required freshman composition course the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. This philosophy of "learning by doing" shapes not only the first year course but also the university's junior year writing requirement which enlists all academic units in stressing the importance of good writing. Moran directs the two-part writing program, which was introduced with the class of 1986.

Most freshmen begin the writing program with College Writing. The three-credit course provides the writ-

ing skills necessary for students' college work, careers, and lives in general, says Moran. Its complement is the junior year requirement—a three-credit activity designed by each academic unit to emphasize the writing process in its field.

The move to the two-part requirement began in 1982 with a faculty review of the old rhetoric requirement. Deciding that a different approach was needed, the review committee asked several experienced writing instructors to design a new program. A guiding principle in their design was the recognition that writing performance is affected by students' perception of faculty expectations.

"If one group in the university is on a soap box saying 'writing is important,' and everyone else is yawning, that group is simply ignored," says Moran. "We wanted to send students the message that writing counts at this institution."

The freshman writing course introduces this message with a force that Moran describes as "monomaniacal." Instructors focus on students' writing, using their essays as the course's primary text. Students examine their classmates' writing, diagraming the essays' structure and discussing how changes in tone would alter the pieces. Essays are peer-edited, revised, faculty-reviewed, and rewritten.

Instructors read diagnostically, determining what writing problems each student needs to address most. Believing that a writer's work includes discovering what to write about, Moran discourages instructors from assigning every essay topic. Students complete seven essays, keeping a portfolio of each piece's drafts. They discuss their progress in individual conferences.

To provide such specialized attention to freshman classes averaging 4,500 students requires ten English professors and 80 graduate teaching assistants (TAs), the majority of whom are in the English department. Each professor serves as a course director, teaching one of the 130 sections scheduled each semester and supervising six or seven TAs who teach additional sections. Maximum class size is 20 students.

Moran meets regularly with course directors, who meet weekly with TAs and visit their classes. New TAs practice writing, peer editing, and diagnostic techniques in summer workshops and design syllabi with the assistance of veteran TAs.

While all students satisfy the freshman writing requirement by completing College Writing, a few must first take Basic Writing. Directed at students who need practice in the rudiments of writing, the course introduces a step-by-step process that guides them through choosing a topic to rewriting. These students are identified through essays prepared during summer counseling. TAs trained in holistic scoring read each essay and compare it with essays chosen to represent each point on a 1 to 6 scale.

Students receiving top scores on their essays or advanced placement tests are exempt from the freshman writing requirement. Moran estimates that about five percent of the freshman class receives this exemption and that approximately five to ten percent must take Basic Writing. These figures may change as Massachusetts high schools place greater emphasis on writing. Since 1978 the university has offered writing workshops for high school teachers in all disciplines.

Writing Requirements in Students' Majors

All students must complete the writing activity designed by their major department to fullfill the junior year requirement. These range from the new Writing in Physics and Astronomy to a variety of writing assignments added to the two-semester sequence of Audiology I and Speech Pathology I required of all communication disorders majors. Says Moran: "We like them to send their students the message that sociologists, for example, write, that one writes in sociology, or that writing can help you learn sociology."

Guidelines for junior year writing courses are general: courses must include regular, frequent writing and opportunities to revise. Course proposals should explain how the course is related to the major and what kinds of writing will be required. In developing the requirement, the junior year writing program subcommittee, part of the university-wide writing committee, met with department representatives to learn their interests and concerns.

'If one group in the university is on a soap box saying 'writing is important,' and everyone else is yawning, that group is simply ignored.'

With funds from the old rhetoric program, the writing program provides stipends to each department based on its number of juniors. Approximately two-thirds of the departments will use the funds to hire TAs for other courses so that faculty members can teach the junior year writing course. Only majors can take their department's writing course.

The subcommittee reviews each course proposal, often suggesting modifications. Its role is not to approve courses but to facilitate the process by which courses are approved through regular procedures, says Sylvia Forman, subcommittee member and chairperson of the anthropology department. By indicating its support, the subcommittee reduces the analysis of a course at the curriculum committee level.

Workshops Provide Theory and Practice

In addition to informal meetings with instructors, the writing program has sponsored day-long training workshops. They have introduced the latest research on the theory and practice of writing; future sessions will deal with actual assignments. Forman credits the workshops' success to the use of speakers from departments other than English—a technique which reinforces the program's emphasis on the process of writing in the disciplines and not on grammar.

Fall 1984 marks the first semester in which all academic units' junior year writing courses are in place. In Forman's Writing in Anthropology, for example, anthropology majors will select a topic of interest to research and discuss in all of the semester's writing assignments, which include short journal articles, technical reports, popular articles, and research proposals.

Physics majors will learn about the latest research in physics in Writing in Physics and Astronomy. Every two weeks guest lecturers, usually department members, will discuss their current work. Students will interview speakers, conduct library research, and prepare 1,000-word papers on each topic. Formats will include newspaper articles, physics journal articles, biographies, and articles aimed at nonphysics majors. Papers will be reviewed by students, the TA, and the instructor.

The special challenge facing language instructors in developing junior year writing courses was confronted by the Slavic Languages Department with Translation from Russian into English. Believing that students' translations are often affected by their inability to find the true English equivalent, the department argued that translation is a good way to focus the writer's attention on the importance of individual word choices. Students also will write critiques of each other's translations, English summaries of Russian passages, and descriptions of Soviet periodicals. Other language departments are not using translation assignments in their junior year writing courses.

Forman speculates that the junior year writing program will be revised someday. She admits that some departments are doing things that the subcommittee does not think will work very well. By giving departments the responsibility for designing their own courses, the subcommittee has made them participants in the process and ensured their future commitment to any requirement revisions, she says.

Moran believes the junior year requirement has the potential for creating a university atmosphere in which good writing is required. "Every objective test and every course that has no writing are statements that writing does not count," he says. "Good writing does matter and it takes practice." *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Charles Moran, Director, Writing Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003. 413/545-0610.

Ithaca College
Advising Students to Write

Interest in writing among students and faculty at Ithaca College is high, says Howard S. Erlich, assistant dean of the School of Humanities and Sciences. So high, he reports, that in 1970 the Writing and Reading Program split from the English department to pursue its own activities; that student demand for writing instruction in 1979-80 exceeded the number of courses available; and that today, there is a writing course open to every entering student. "The surprising thing about the situation," says Erlich, "is that we do not have a campus-wide writing requirement."

Based on the results of a writing sample, Standard Aptitude Test scores, and high school performance, the School of Humanities and Sciences administrators develop a verbal skills composite of all freshmen, advising them to take basic or more advanced writing courses according to their needs. "It is not mandatory, however, that students follow this advice," Erlich says. "Yet, almost all of them do. Even upperclass students will take a basic writing course that they may have missed as freshmen. Students heed our advice because they realize that to be successful at the college level and beyond necessitates good communications skills."

'Our main purpose is not to make writing instructors of disciplinary faculty...'

Writing Opportunities at All Levels

Erlich notes that the wide range of courses available through the Writing Program gives students the opportunity to satisfy different needs. According to the Humanities and Sciences catalog, the program's curriculum is designed to "improve basic writing and reading skills, comprehension of expositional strategies, and techniques of creative writing."

Advisers encourage freshmen whose writing skills need to be sharpened to begin with one of the three basic courses offered by the Writing Program. These are Writing from Sources, which, says Erlich, "emphasizes the connection between facility in reading and improved writing;" Foundations of Writing, focusing on the academic essay; and Personal Writing, in which students analyze their own experiences.

For the more advanced writers, there are freshman writing seminars—disciplinary courses which involve the teaching of writing skills. Each writing seminar accepts up to 18 students, and approximately 10 percent of the freshman class in the School of Humanities and Sciences enrolls in these courses, says Erlich. "The writing seminars," says Erlich, "do not operate under the auspices of the Writing Program; rather, they are offered through disciplinary departments. We have been conscious about keeping these courses separate from those in the Writing Program because we believe that the integrity of each of the disciplines should be maintained."

Freshman writing seminars evolved from an experimental project supported by the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The Ithaca College Project, completed in 1980, attempted to integrate writing, speaking and listening, and language and reasoning skills into liberal arts courses. This objective, says Erlich, though successful,

was "too ambitious;" many faculty members felt that they were sacrificing content coverage to teach basic skills. "For the writing seminars," says Erlich, "we are not willing to diverge from our main goal—improving student writing—by including any of the other areas emphasized by the FIPSE project. Our main purpose is not to make writing instructors of disciplinary faculty; rather, it is to show them that students will produce higher quality work if they are assigned tasks which develop writing skills."

Seminars Focus on Special Topics

Six freshman writing seminars will be offered in the fall 1984 semester: three in English literature, and one each in German, mathematics, and speech communications. Termed "special topics" courses, the writing seminars are not prerequisites for other courses, says Erlich, and faculty members are not obligated, as they were in the FIPSE project, to cover a prescribed amount of material. "Thus," says Erlich, "professors do not have to make the choice between covering content and teaching writing. This also gives them opportunity to create a course unrelated to the regular curriculum." Such courses include Community and Justice in the history department, and American Dwellings in the anthropology department.

Writing seminar faculty must take a writing workshop before they teach their courses; the writing department offers an average of three workshops each semester to all faculty members. Some typical themes are plagiarism, how to make effective writing assignments, responding to student writing, and incorporating reading instruction in the classroom. Erlich emphasizes that writing seminar faculty members are not told how and what to teach. "The only common requirement is that all students must complete 20 to 25 pages of finished prose," he says. "However, we know that each of the seminars uses some kind of peer analysis, student conferencing, and multiple drafts."

Commenting upon Ithaca's voluntary approach to writing, Erlich maintains that a writing requirement is not needed. "Almost 100 percent of our incoming freshmen take a writing class their first year," he says. "Some take two." And the interest continues after freshman year: Although a nondegree program, Writing does offer students a minor in writing which, comments Erlich, "is extremely popular." He says: "More than 90 students are presently minoring in the writing program; for a campus of our size (approximately 5,000 students), that is quite substantial." Faculty support of the writing efforts is also positive; "half of the Humanities and Sciences faculty have attended a writing workshop," says Erlich. In having students and professors elect to participate in writing courses without being required to do so, Erlich believes that Ithaca has combined "the best of both worlds." *N.M.*

For more information, contact Howard S. Erlich, Assistant Dean of the School of Humanities and Sciences, Ithaca College, NY 14850. 607/274-3102.

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College

Campus Commitment to Communication Curriculum

Disciplinary-based writing courses are the first of a three-prong effort to improve students' communication skills at St. Mary-of-the-Woods College. At a 1981 campus-wide Conference on the Future, participants recognized a need for a new college mission, says Stephen L. Trainor, director of the Writing Across the Curriculum project. "We decided to plan an information age curriculum," says Trainor, "that would prepare students to be very good communicators, especially in writing, speaking, and computers."

A Roman Catholic liberal arts college for women, St. Mary-of-the-Woods has 700 students divided equally between residential students and nontraditional-aged learners in the external degree program. In addition to the writing courses, students complete a new 60-credit general studies program that emphasizes language arts and learning as a developmental process.

Admitting that faculty at first joked about what else could be introduced using an "across the curriculum" format, Trainor reports that serious efforts soon began to determine how all departments could assist with the new communication emphasis. The English department initiated a two-year project to integrate writing instruction into the general curriculum. Funded by the Exxon Education Foundation, the project included faculty development and the introduction of advanced writing courses in all departments.

An underlying principle in the college's approach is that freshman courses are not enough to substantially improve students' communication abilities; undergraduates need to practice these skills throughout their four years. Beginning in fall 1984, students must choose two advanced writing emphasis courses in addition to freshman composition.

The Exxon project began with introductory faculty workshops in fall 1981. Writing experts discussed recent research on writing problems and instruction. Staff explained the project philosophy, including the rule that faculty must attend a seminar on the teaching of writing before offering a writing emphasis course; twenty-two faculty members from 15 departments expressed interest in participating.

During the next three semesters, the English department offered three seven-session seminars. Participants discussed the current writing program and learned how to introduce writing in existing courses. Seminars ran from late afternoon until early evening with a break for dinner.

Seminars Promote Community Spirit

"The seminars turned out to be the best aspect of the project," says Trainor. "People who only see each other

in the faculty assembly were working together on a common academic problem. It was good for their morale." The English department waited until after the first seminar was held before asking faculty to approve the writing emphasis requirement, an effective way to ensure that more people were familiar with the proposal's details, says Trainor.

The writing project allows a great deal of leeway in how instructors integrate writing into their courses and does not require course approval. Trainor lists the required characteristics of writing emphasis courses as "a developmental arrangement of writing assignments, the development of a sense of audience in the student writer, emphasis on writing as a process, and adherence to common performance criteria." The focus, he says, is on how writing is taught rather than the amount of writing.

Seminar graduates introduced writing emphasis courses in fall 1982. Beginning in fall 1984, all departments must offer a writing emphasis course each year. Students fulfill the requirement with courses ranging from Contemporary Theatre and Human Physiology to Statistics and Introduction to Mental Retardation.

Contemporary Soviet History uses movies, readings, and lectures to introduce Soviet life, politics, and foreign policy since 1917. Students review movies and comment on guest lectures, as well as complete such traditional assignments as bibliographies and research papers. They practice different writing modes including arguments, descriptions, and comparisons.

Assignments in an introductory course on mental retardation include etiological reports of diseases associated with mental retardation and summaries of how the news media covered special education during the semester. Students in Introduction to Computer Programming learn how to write BASIC programs. They describe the components and process of preparing programs as part of their writing assignments.

Freshman courses are not enough to substantially improve students' communication abilities.

Speaking Across the Curriculum

The writing project has demonstrated a successful model for integrating the new communication emphasis into the curriculum, says Trainor. A similar effort is underway with the Speaking Across the Curriculum project. With additional Exxon funding, the college has established a speech laboratory and planned faculty seminars on introducing speaking assignments into content courses. Instructors quickly signed up for the first seminar on the teaching of speech in fall 1984. Trainor anticipates that students will be required to continue to take the freshman Fundamentals of Speech, as well as one speech emphasis course.

Computing Across the Curriculum is still a long way away, says Trainor, although students already take a computer literacy course as part of the general studies program. Administrators have formed a task force to explore a number of related issues, including the possibility of offering a computer science major or minor.

Once all three programs are in place, faculty members may reduce the upper level communication requirements to one course each in writing, speaking, and computing. "We do not want to overburden students," says Trainor, who reports that the phrase "writing intensive course" was changed to "writing emphasis course" when faculty feared that students would find the former too threatening. He advises colleagues interested in introducing similar requirements to keep students informed of their activities.

The college has accomplished what it set out to do, says Trainor. "This project has given flesh and bone to our college-wide commitment to communication. Small liberal arts colleges have to position themselves in the future as having a particular strength if they are going to survive." *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Stephen L. Trainor, Director, Writing Across the Curriculum, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, IN 47876. 812/535-5209.

Towson State University

Refining Students' Writing Skills

The opportunity to perfect their writing skills in discipline-based courses has proven attractive to Towson State University students who often complete more than the minimum composition requirement. Since 1976 the university has required all undergraduates to complete one upper level writing course in addition to freshman composition. Forty courses from 22 departments currently satisfy the requirement.

Designers of the new arrangement believed that upper level students would be better motivated if they could elect their second writing course in the discipline of their own choosing rather than being required to take another English course, says Fil Dowling, coordinator of the Second Writing Course Program and associate professor of English. By not requiring every department to offer an advanced writing course, the program also focuses on teachers with genuine interest in developing and teaching these courses, he says.

The additional writing requirement was part of a 1976 general education revision. Faculty recognized that students needed extra practice in writing; based on their Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, approximately 30 percent of the freshman class must complete a remedial writing course before taking the required freshman composition course. Dowling describes College Writing as a traditional composition course focused strictly on writing.

In contrast, the majority of courses approved for the Second Writing Course Program are content courses

which use writing as a mode of learning. Others are skills courses, such as Feature Writing and Writing in Speech Pathology, which do not cover any specific content. Departments develop the type of courses they prefer; enrollment in both types of courses is limited to 18 students.

Course approval is awarded by the University Curriculum Committee's Second Writing Course Subcommittee. Representative of the university, the subcommittee evaluates and approves syllabi and assists Dowling with faculty development. This latter activity, as well as Dowling's position, were added by administrators in 1982 to ensure the program's coherence. The coordinator of the program has 50 percent released time and reports to the dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Second Writing Course Criteria

The subcommittee has developed written criteria for the second writing courses. Students must write at least 5,000 words during the semester, divided among at least three assignments. This stipulation recognizes that writing is a skill that takes practice, says Dowling, who prefers a larger number of shorter writing assignments. Writing's importance in these courses is further emphasized by requiring a writing handbook as one of the course textbooks.

Faculty must also integrate writing with the course content. At least 50 percent of the final grade must be based on writing quality—a confirmation that students' ability to write about a subject can be used to evaluate their understanding of it. Dowling anticipates that within the next two years the university will dictate that students must earn a C or better in these courses to fulfill the advanced writing requirement, a rule already in place for freshman composition.

Campus-wide efforts have just about eliminated the old 'leave-writing-to-the-English-teachers' attitude.

The subcommittee rarely approves course proposals on the first round, reports Dowling. Members offer comments and suggestions for revision, helping shape the course to fit the criteria. Courses may be new offerings or altered versions of existing courses. Currently approved courses include Medical Geography, History of the Dance, and Comparative Economic Systems.

Sport and Society was first approved in 1977 and has been fine tuned to include a variety of writing assignments. Students begin with an essay on sports as a microcosm of society, based on readings which introduce the course theme. They next rewrite a Spiro Agnew speech which emphasized the shared values of sports and business. Their third assignment is to contrast a circa-1900 newspaper report of a sporting even with one from the present. The semester concludes with annotated bibliographies and research proposals. With the exception of the final project, students are allowed to revise their papers.

In Introduction to Criminal Justice, students complete assignments similar to those prepared by professionals in the field. They study actual reports for accuracy and effectiveness. Writing assignments include police accident reports, legal memoranda, and inmates' classification summaries.

Helping Teachers Teach Writing

An important facet of the advanced writing program's philosophy is that "the experts in teaching writing in any particular field are the content teachers who know that field," says Dowling. "They have read, and in most cases written, books and articles in their field, and know what is considered good writing." Once instructors recognize this they feel more confident evaluating writing. As Dowling points out, few college English teachers received training in the teaching of writing.

To aid individual teachers, Dowling serves as a consultant in the teaching of writing. He sits in on a second writing course class for three to four weeks, talks with the instructor before and after class, and reviews the syllabus and assignments. During the last two-and-a-half years, Dowling has visited about a third of the advanced writing courses outside the English department. His visits are neither mandatory nor evaluative.

"I decided the best way to help anyone teach writing was to understand what the teacher was doing and deal with that person on a one-to-one basis," says Dowling. During his class visits he completes reading and writing assignments and participates in small group activities, sharing his work with the instructor. Depending on the teacher's concerns, he will discuss different writing instruction approaches and compare his grading of assignments with his or hers. He resists lecturing to the class to avoid reinforcing the notion that only English professors know how to write.

The subcommittee has also begun to offer workshops for instructors interested in cross-disciplinary writing. Based on participants' evaluations, Dowling calls the workshops a success. He drew half of the six workshop facilitators at a recent meeting from outside the English department, a task he believes was important although not easy as instructors expressed reluctance to be seen as writing experts. Discussions ranged from the facilitators' own experiences and new approaches to teaching writing to assignment planning and evaluation.

Recognizing that workshop participants often want "something they can use in class tomorrow," Dowling prepared several handouts on the workshop topics. He also distributes a fact sheet which offers teachers unaccustomed to teaching writing, characteristics of effective writing to look for in students' pieces.

Although the Second Writing Course Subcommittee has not exercised its authority to evaluate the program, Dowling believes the campus-wide efforts have just about eliminated the old "leave-writing-instruction-to-the-English-teachers" attitude. Faculty members are interested in what other teachers of writing are doing, and juniors and seniors are eager to practice the writing styles they will find in their own fields as well as in others.

Dowling plans to include questions about the advanced writing program in the regular followups conducted with Towson graduates. *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Fil Dowling, Coordinator of the Second Writing Course Program, Department of English, Towson State University, Towson, MD 21204. 301/828-0839.

University of Pennsylvania

Writing for Excellence

"At the University of Pennsylvania there is general agreement that writing is one of the primary intellectual tools that students need, and that writing must be encouraged and supported," says Peshe Kuriloff, coordinator of the University Writing Center and Writing Across the University Program. Noting that some writing programs may be directed at students' writing deficiencies, Kuriloff reports that the University of Pennsylvania programs "promote excellence." "We do not want our students to be just adequate writers," says Kuriloff, "we want them to be fine writers. We think that writing is closely affiliated with students' intellectual, academic, and professional skills; thus, in order to be a quality university and turn out educated students, writing must be a top priority."

The Writing Across the University Program, part of the English department, offers three types of courses which correspond to student expertise and grade level. These are disciplinary courses which, on the initiative of their professors, become affiliated with the program and integrate the teaching of writing into the course content. Student reception of these courses has been positive, according to Kuriloff. "A very large percentage of our students want to learn to write well," she says. "Some feel they already do, and some do not, but all believe writing is a skill they should have, and need to develop."

Developing a Writing Habit

The basic philosophy underlying the three types of Writing Across the University courses is "writing as process." "Our goal is not to get students to write more papers," says Kuriloff, "but to write more—both formally and informally."

For freshmen, there is a seminar program in which writing skills are heavily emphasized. Freshman seminars are usually offered by the English department, and teach writing through the study of literature and poetry. Courses include the Craft of Prose, Literature and Human Values, and the Art of Drama. Courses outside the English department, such as History of Opera, are also part of the program.

Upperclass students may enroll in advanced disciplinary courses "which provide instruction in the techniques of formulating, organized drafting, and revising the advanced forms of exposition appropriate to a field," says Kuriloff. Students study and evaluate professional writing in their respective fields, and learn how to write for their fields at the professional level. Advanced disciplinary courses affiliated with the Writing Across the University Program are often senior seminars or graduate classes. Says Kuriloff, "In these courses, writing is viewed as part of a student's professional training."

The most common type of course affiliation with the program, notes Kuriloff, are the writing enrichment courses. Although writing enrichment courses, like the freshman seminars and the advanced disciplinary courses, are electives, participation is high, maintains Kuriloff. "During the 1983-84 academic year," she says, "86 writing enrichment courses were offered in 29 departments and schools, and approximately 2,800 students enrolled."

Kuriloff meets with each participating professor to outline writing enrichment course objectives, which must be incorporated into the coursework. "The requirements are that all professors must emphasize the writing process, require some form of informal writing, and require students to submit their papers in draft form," she says. Although the professors develop course requirements, graduate assistants are responsible for teaching the writing enrichment courses or sections.

Teaching assistants in writing enrichment courses receive additional stipends and must participate in an on-going training program offered each semester. The teaching assistants, called curriculum fellows, attend an orientation day, group meetings with on-campus writing and education experts, and talks given by guest lecturers. "We try to bring the curriculum fellows up-to-date in the field of composition theory, and help them move from the very conventional academic view of 'writing as product' to 'writing as process,'" says Kuriloff. Once the curriculum fellows are exposed to the philosophy of the program, program advisers introduce them to such topics as collaborative learning, development of good writing assignments, and student ownership of writing.

"During the 1983-84 academic year, 86 writing enrichment courses were offered in 29 departments and schools..."

Writing Center Aids Curriculum Fellows

Curriculum fellows also receive support from the university's writing center staff members—graduate students experienced in the teaching of writing. Each of the 12 writing center staff members works with five curriculum fellows. "They help the curriculum fellows establish writing assignments and recognize writing problems," says Kuriloff, "and work with students whose

writing difficulties are beyond the curriculum fellows' expertise."

Assignments in each writing enrichment course vary according to the discipline, comments Kuriloff, but all differ from non-affiliated courses and sections in the amount of writing done. "Students in writing enrichment classes do more informal writing in and out of class, says Kuriloff, "whether it be keeping a journal, writing regularly and reading their writing in class, or analyzing reading assignments in writing." She points out, however, that students in writing enrichment classes do not feel overburdened by the assignments. "Students have not complained about the writing enrichment courses being more work because the requirements—habitual writing, turning in and revising drafts, etc.—assist them in doing well in the courses," she says.

Noting that the university has no composition requirements, Kuriloff maintains that students who choose to take writing courses on their own are much more motivated than they would be if they were required to do so. "We find that we get a lot more mileage out of the Writing Across the University Program because it is completely voluntary," she says. "Students work harder and accomplish much more." *N.M.*

For more information, contact Peshe Kuriloff, Coordinator of the University Writing Center and Writing Across the University Program, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104. 215/898-4566.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

Albright College

Writing Intensive Courses for all Majors

Beginning in fall 1984, freshmen at Albright College will be exposed to the concepts of multiple draft and peer review in their composition classes. In addition, students in every major will be required to take at least one writing intensive course in their discipline after the freshman year.

The changes at Albright stem from a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) consultancy grant administered from 1980 to 1983 by Sarel Fuchs, associate professor of classics and education. "Albright has always had a strong composition program," says Fuchs, "but our concern was that we were not giving our students the chance to develop further the writing skills they acquired as freshmen."

During the grant period a consultant visited the campus approximately twice a year, led seminars for Albright faculty, disseminated information concerning writing across the curriculum in the 1980s, and "brought to the faculty an awareness of alternate means of dealing with composition," Fuchs says. About two-thirds of the faculty attended these seminars and, after some initial resistance from a very few, approved the new program without changes. "During those seminars we started to see that we were not merely talking about writing," says Fuchs. "While some of our faculty at first were not particularly interested in teaching writing, the development of this program became a matter of not only working with writing, but working with teaching methodology and learning per se."

The freshman composition requirement includes Composition, a basic writing course from which some students are exempt, and Writing about Literature, in which students write a series of papers based on readings determined by the instructor. The new program is superimposed on the basic composition course requirements, according to Richard Androne, associate professor of English. All composition instructors are asked to introduce freshmen to the ideas of multiple draft and peer review. Some may use the techniques for only one or two papers, while others may choose to teach their entire class that way. "It is voluntary as to how much each instructor uses the techniques," says Androne.

Students will learn that their first draft will not necessarily be the only one. Conferences with the instructor and reviews by other students will help them prepare a second, third, even fourth draft and use writing as a "way of knowing," Androne says.

Content Courses Satisfy Writing Requirement

As writing facilitator for Albright, Androne served as liaison to departments as they developed writing intensive courses for each major program. Thirty-six individual courses in 26 programs have been approved by a curriculum comittee after it examined course philosophy and syllabi. The writing intensive courses are designed to initiate students into the ways of research within an area of concentration. While some departments created new courses to fulfill the writing intensive requirement, most chose to adapt existing courses such as senior seminars, in which students previously wrote only one paper.

"All the areas of concentration are to develop the skills that the English department worked so hard to teach in that freshman year," says Fuchs. "And in most cases faculty realize it is more profitable at the undergraduate level to assign shorter, more focused papers rather than telling students they have eight weeks to complete one large paper."

Albright's five-year-old writing center will supplement the new programs by acting as a "counseling and troubleshooting center," says Androne. "The requirement is that the students must have a piece of writing when they come in. It does not function as a place where students can develop a first draft."

Says Fuchs: "Working with faculty to develop new ideas, perhaps change attitudes, is a slow, often painful, frustrating, and subtle process. To bring faculty around to a new way of looking at things takes a lot of time and careful consideration, and an awful lot of patience. We have made tremendous progress in four years." *S.H.*

For more information, contact Richard Androne, Associate Professor of English, or Sarel Fuchs, Associate Professor of Classics and Education, Albright College, P.O. Box 516, Reading, PA 19603. 215/921-2381.

The University of Chicago

Theory Aids Writing Style

"Writing is a systematic problem that does not end when people graduate," says University of Chicago English Professor Joseph M. Williams. "As editors, managers, and communicators, our graduates will have responsibility for the writing of others. They need to learn not only to write well, but to communicate to others what it means to write well."

To address these concerns Williams and three colleagues developed Advanced Professional Writing, a junior/senior course that examines writing styles appropriate to different fields and disciplines. They base the course on their research in discourse and language and experience solving the writing problems of executives in law firms, corporations, and government offices.

Offered since 1981, the course attracts approximately 100 students each winter quarter, with an additional 40 students taking a summer version taught by graduate students. By limiting the course to juniors and seniors, instructors believe students

are better motivated to improve their writing and more familiar with their disciplines' professional prose.

In weekly lectures the instructors discuss style and arrangement of information and introduce principles of effective writing. They talk about various writing conventions, describing styles that make one recognizable as a professional in his or her field. Writing assignments include a discussion of why a difficult discipline-based issue is important to a more general audience and an obituary of a famous person that describes his or her contribution to the student's field.

Tutorials Geared to Disciplines

Students discuss their writing in weekly group tutorials led by the course's 15 graduate tutors. Instructors divide the class into small groups by discipline, matching students with tutors from their own discipline whenever possible. This approach offers students additional insights on the application of writing principles to their own fields and a writing instructor familiar with the substance of their papers, says Williams.

Tutors are selected on the basis of writing samples, recommendations, and comments on sample student papers. They must attend a fall quarter seminar on theories of discourse and language, learning, for example, that the socialization process in any field can lead to stilted writing as novices attempt to emulate professional prose. In tutorials similar to those they will lead, they practice analyzing each other's writing. During the winter quarter instructors evaluate tutors' small group sessions and comments on student papers.

Both tutors and undergraduates discover that Advanced Professional Writing's grounding in theory is valuable to their future careers, claims Williams. "The theoretical framework gives them a way to think about writing, analyze it, and explain it to others in ways that go beyond 'gut reactions,' " he says. "Correcting others requires us to understand, justify, and explain our criteria. It has always seemed easier for professionals and managers to endure unreadable writing, or if unable to ignore it, to edit it themselves, rather than to try to explain to its author what in fact counts as clear, precise, forceful prose."

Advanced Professional Writing's impact is spreading to other members of the campus community. On Saturday mornings two of the course's tutors offer a writing course for interested graduate students. Beginning in fall 1984 veteran tutors will also help teach writing in the core program's humanities courses. Taught by faculty members from across the university, the courses introduce students to college writing. Williams observes that faculty outside the English department are often uncomfortable teaching writing and will benefit from the tutors' training and experience.

A future goal is to sponsor bag lunches for faculty to discuss and analyze their own discourse. "People have difficulty explaining what makes one essay sound amateurish and another professional," says Williams. "The answer can help them write better and teach others to write better." *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Joseph M. Williams, Professor of English, The University of Chicago, 5811 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637. 312/962-7997.

Eastern Oregon State College

Exam Ensures Writing Proficiency

Campus-wide commitment to graduating skilled writers is demonstrated by Eastern Oregon State College's writing proficiency examination (WPE). Since 1975, all students in four-year degree programs have been required to pass a three-hour essay examination.

The WPE replaced a required three-course writing sequence that extended over the freshman, sophomore, and junior years. Faculty members unanimously supported the change, realizing that composition instructors' efforts had been thwarted by content courses that did not reemphasize the importance of good writing or provide opportunities to refine skills, says Writing Coordinator Lois Barry.

Instructors from all departments contribute topics for the WPE. Students have the option of responding to a general interest topic or one prepared by their major department. On a recent examination biology majors read a report of a citizens meeting with wildlife officials on the problem of alligators encroaching on residential areas, and chose one side to defend. The general topic question presented a newspaper feature that detailed the author's purchase of items for her unrealized "secret self" and asked students to describe their buying habits.

Barry has trained faculty volunteers from every discipline to read the WPE essays. Volunteers participate in training sessions aimed at ensuring that all readers employ the same standards. After each examination, readers receive a comparison of their scores with those of other readers. If instructors consistently grade higher or lower than other readers and will not alter their grading, they no longer serve as readers.

In 1983 administrators decided that students must complete one composition course before taking the WPE; a recognition, according to Barry, that too many unprepared students were taking the test to see what it was like. Since instituting this new requirement, approximately 65 percent of the students pass the WPE on the first try. Administrators require students to attempt the WPE by the first term of their junior year to ensure enough time to address writing problems. Students must complete an additional writing course each time they fail the WPE and before they can take the test again.

The English department offers a number of courses designed to improve writing skills. These include workshops in expository or exploratory writing (the courses that satisfy the composition course requirement) and research writing and introductory and advanced composition. In expository writing freshmen practice standard compositional modes, while exploratory writing students focus on their own experiences and observations.

Disciplinary Courses to Improve Writing Skills

To further emphasize the importance of writing in all disciplines, instructors plan to introduce disciplinary-based writing courses that can be elected by students who need to complete additional writing courses before retaking the WPE. Barry anticipates that these courses will begin in fall 1985. The new courses will complement ongoing efforts to emphasize writing as a means of learning. Since 1981 more than half of the faculty have attended workshops on integrating writing into content courses.

Funded by the Northwest Area Foundation, the workshops emphasized Barry's philosophy that writing enhances students' understanding and retention of content. Says Barry: "This realization serves to continue professors' interest in using more writing in their classes, whereas the 'every-professor-as-teacher-of-writing' approach will ultimately be dissipated by other demands on professors' time."

Workshop participants now use writing assignments that increase students' understanding of content. A nursing instructor asks students to define professional nursing, summarize current research related to the course, and compare their views on nursing with those of a nursing theorist. History students write a précis on their readings and respond to controversial interpretations of history. In statistics, students must fully explain their calculations on examinations, and investigate a topic that requires statistical analysis and describe it to a lay audience.

Disciplinary-based courses approved for writing course credit in fall 1985 will represent only a small fraction of the courses which use both graded and ungraded writing as a learning tool, reports Barry. "Although we may only introduce six to eight writing prefix courses next fall," she says, "we have 50 faculty

members who have added writing to their courses to help students understand the subject matter." *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Lois Barry, Writing Coordinator, Eastern Oregon State College, 8th & K, La Grande, OR 97850. 503/963-1572.

Kalamazoo College

Writing Options Based on Skill

In 1979 Kalamazoo College faculty members approved writing proficiency as a graduation requirement for all students. Their vote indicated growing dissatisfaction with students' writing, says Gail B. Griffin, associate professor of English. Although Expository Prose, a freshman writing course, was offered, few enrolled in the "strongly recommended" elective. With the new graduation requirement, 80 percent of the freshmen must complete either Expository Prose or a freshman seminar that includes writing assignments.

The English department determines how each student will satisfy the requirement. They base their decision on a grammar, short essay, and reading comprehension test given before fall classes. Instructors place students in four categories: exempt from writing courses, required to take a freshman seminar, required to take Expository Prose during the freshman year, and required to take Expository Prose during the fall quarter. Some students are exempt from the test and requirement on the basis of advanced placement scores or an essay scholarship examination given to high school seniors.

Approximately 50 percent of the 300-member freshman class must take Expository Prose. The English department redesigned the course in response to the new requirement. All six members of the department teach course sections, which were reduced from 24 to 20 students. Instructors choose an annual theme for all sections. The fall 1984 theme is The Sixties; previous themes were The Twenties, Darwin and Darwinism, and Language and Communication. Because students write on the theme rather than about literature, students acquire writing skills applicable to other disciplines, says Griffin.

Instructors use the same topical anthology but design their own assignments. Griffin admits that the theme sometimes suffers as instructors devote more attention to writing basics. All students must complete a final ten-page research paper related to the theme. A reference librarian brings reference and theme-related books to the classes and explains how to construct a bibliography.

Seminars Include Writing Assignments

Students placed in freshman seminars do not need as much writing instruction as those in Expository Prose, reports Griffin. Taught by faculty members from a variety of departments, the seminars focus on such themes as Morality and International Relations and Government and Space Exploration. Seminars are reading and discussion courses, making them especially appropriate for students who scored low in reading comprehension on the placement test, says Griffin. Instructors deal with writing problems outside of class.

Only those seminars which require at least five papers fulfill the writing requirement. Assignments vary. For example, in History and the Novel students write short papers every other week that focus on points raised by the readings. The instructor gives one lecture on grammar and style and regularly asks students to rewrite papers based on his comments. Assignments in Coming of Age—Some Literary Perspectives range from critical studies and short answers to specific questions to autobiographies and individual responses to the course theme.

Griffin believes the writing requirement and placement test let students know immediately that writing is a priority at Kalamazoo. She would like to see this reinforced with more writing in other courses. Some students, especially those in the sciences, do not write any other papers until the required Senior Individualized Project, an off-campus study project that may include creative writing, a research paper, or internship report. *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Gail B. Griffin, Associate Professor of English, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI 49007. 616/383-8525.

Moravian College

Creating a "Writing Environment"

A 1980 survey of 77 full-time Moravian College professors revealed that 32 percent of the respondents believed students "lacked knowledge of basic English," notes George S. Diamond, associate professor of English. What needed to be done, he says, was to "raise the faculty consciousness" about what they should expect from students. "Once students understand that professors in all disciplines are demanding good writing, they will adjust the quality of their work upward," says Diamond. Moravian's Writing Program, begun in 1980 with the aid of a grant from the International Paper Company Foundation, was implemented to create "a new writing environment," one which would reinforce students' writing skills throughout their four years of study, Diamond says.

To achieve this objective, reports Diamond, faculty, administrators and students needed to view the art of writing in a new way, one that has become the pedagogical foundation upon which all projects connected with the Writing Program are centered: writing as process, taught and learned by stages. "The writing process develops the notion that a student's paper is not just a finished product," says Diamond, "but rather a creation which the professor can nurture from its inception as an idea in the mind of the student, to a developed, edited paper at the end."

In 1981 and 1982, interested faculty were introduced to the process writing concept at seminars conducted by an outside consultant, which illustrated how to stimulate that process in students. Diamond notes that learning aids emphasized at these seminars, such as journal writing, research packets, and peer critiquing, have become an integral part of freshman composition and literature courses. All students must take both a composition and a literature course.

These courses have been restructured to include a uniform number of writing assignments: five papers in English 100, the composition course, and three in all basic literature courses. "To reinforce the idea of process," Diamond says, "students turn in their work at various stages of its development; they then learn how to edit and revise by reviewing their rough drafts with their professors. With this technique, we have moved away from rote teaching, in which the professor assigns a composition and sees nothing of its creation except the final product."

Integrating Writing Into Content Courses

Such attention to writing is not limited to the English department, Diamond says. "Part of our method to improve the quality of writing entails engaging faculty in other disciplines to reinforce the notion among students that writing is important—not just in English classes, but in all classes," he says.

Working to create the "writing environment," professors in many other disciplines, from accounting to genetics to foreign languages, have incorporated a writing component into their courses, introducing research papers, journals, and essay questions on tests which were formally objective. "In classes where a writing component always existed," says Diamond, "the Writing Project has helped to increase standards. Previously, especially in science classes, the general feeling was that as long as a student had the correct answer, the manner in which he or she expressed it did not matter greatly. Now there is much

more emphasis on the way technical reports are organized, and how information is imparted."

Another major facet of the Writing Program is the Writing Center, staffed by peer tutors who aid students with serious writing difficulties. In addition to basic remedial help, such as assigning and correcting grammar exercises, peer tutors help students develop good writing habits, such as using the dictionary, and guide them through the editing process so that they can learn to identify their own mistakes and avoid them.

The effects of the Writing Program have been noticeable throughout the college, says Diamond. It is significant, he adds, that another survey taken in 1984 discovered that faculty no longer believed ignorance of basic English was students' greatest writing weakness. Faculty dedication has helped to bring about this improvement, declares Diamond. "Approximately 50 percent of our faculty support the efforts of the Writing Program," he notes. Diamond attributes Moravian's success in garnering faculty support for quality writing across the curriculum partly to the college's intimate size (approximately 2,000 students and 95 full-time faculty members). "As a small school, we can reach faculty in a more personal way," he says. "I believe this is one of the reasons why much of our faculty has responded to the writing campaign so positively." *N.M.*

For more information, contact George S. Diamond, Associate Professor of English, Moravian College, Bethlehem, PA 18018. 215/861-1391.

Orange Coast College

Paired Courses Blend Content and Writing

By pairing content courses with separate sections of Freshman Composition, faculty members at Orange Coast College are combating problems often faced in individual classes, reports Judith B. Salzinski, associate professor of English. Working as a team, instructors introduce students to college level writing within the context of a disciplinary course. This approach overcomes the content instructor's reluctance to assign complex writing projects and gives students something to write about, says Salzinski.

With funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the 24,000-student community college created the Crossover Program, which introduced four paired courses in spring 1984. Students in the program enroll in Freshman Composition and Cultural Anthropology, Preschool Programs, General Geology, or History of the United States Since 1876. The paired courses are scheduled back-to-back, with both instructors present at all times. Students receive a separate grade for each course.

Preparation for the courses began with Crossover leaders choosing general education courses with content easily adapted to composition assignments. Each Crossover team reviewed course content, visited each other's classes, and worked together on syllabi and reading lists for the integrated courses. After studying critical thinking instruction techniques, instructors refined assignments to ensure that students were challenged to synthesize, analyze, and interpret the subject matter.

Crossover's approach emphasizes that "writing is the best practice for thinking about any subject," according to a project report. "We stressed the development of critical thinking skills in conjunction with the writing process," says Salzinski, who teaches the English section of the English/anthropology pairing. "Our colleagues in the content courses admitted that they previously had kept students at the memorization level."

Each Crossover team decides how to integrate writing instruction and assignments with the subject matter of their content course. Courses generally include six to eight writing assignments, opportunities for revision, and preparation of term papers. In the English/history pairing, students listen to content lectures and read related fictional and historical works that demonstrate various rhetorical styles. They prepare summaries of reading assignments, write definition and analytical essays, and complete research projects.

Writing in English and Anthropology

The English/anthropology courses provide insights on the anthropologist's role. In one exercise, student teams practice field research techniques by observing group behaviors at concerts, church services, singles bars, and retirement communities. They summarize their experiences in objective ethnographic reports for the anthropology course and reflect on how they feel as observers in personal experience essays for the composition course.

Crossover instructors enjoyed the team-teaching experience although they discovered that integrating lectures was more difficult than anticipated, says Salzinski. Students liked the paired offerings and expressed interest in taking more integrated general education courses. The instructors will offer the courses again in fall 1984; Salzinski speculates that the program will eventually coordinate eight English/content course pairings.

One factor in Crossover's success was participation by instructors naturally inclined to be generalists rather than by those devoted solely to their own field, says Salzinski. "These courses demonstrate the integrative nature of learning that is often lacking in the supermarket approach to general education," says Salzinski. "This translates into helping students become independent thinkers." *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact Judith B. Salzinski, Associate Professor of English, Orange Coast College, 2701 Fairview Rd., Costa Mesa, CA 92626. 714/432-5593.

Pima College

Collateral Graders Check Writing Style

The Writing Across the Curriculum program on the east campus of Pima Community College was designed in 1982 to integrate writing and content, and to curtail the fragmentation of disciplines, says Stanley Witt, chairperson of the writing department. "We believe that writing is a skill which is used in the learning of content," he says. "It is a method by which the thinking process is strengthened, and thus is contributes to a student's success—no matter what the course."

Faculty members from all disciplines participate in the program. Participants, called content instructors, receive a one-time $100 stipend and must attend a workshop offered at the beginning of each semester by the writing department. Here they develop writing assignments for their classes. These assignments, says Witt, must be created in accordance to criteria prescribed by the writing department. Criteria specify that the writing "be of substantial length—between six to twenty pages, challenge the students' ability to think and research, and be a major assignbment that will be averaged into the final grade." Content instructors must also explain assignment objectives and grading procedures. Courses integrating writing and content include Live Music Experience, in which students attend a concert and write a paper describing it, and Human Beliefs: Origin and Rational Justification, which requires students to interview people about certain beliefs and prepare analyses of their interviews.

Graders Review First Drafts

Before the content instructors evaluate assignments, however, they must submit their students' papers to a "collateral grader," a member of the writing department who judges the writing for its compositional value. "Collateral graders," says Witt, "mark an assignment either *pass* or *rewrite* on the basis of its effective presentation of ideas, logical organization and development, correct documentation, grammar, punctuation,

and spelling." Students who receive a notice of *rewrite* must revise their papers according to the comments made by the collateral grader and resubmit their papers within a week. Passing assignments are graded by the content instructor, and it is this grade, emphasizes Witt, not the collateral grade, which influences a student's success in the course. "Thus," says Witt, "the collateral grader mechanism is a non-threatening way of ensuring that writing assignments meet compositional standards before they are graded for content within a disciplinary course."

Without the collateral grader, an essential element of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program would be missing, says Witt. "Most instructors can recognize poor writing," he says, "but they do not always have the expertise needed to tell students how to correct their mistakes. The collateral grader provides that expertise."

To date, approximately 1,800 students and 100 faculty members have participated in the program. "On a ten-point scale evaluating the worthiness of the program," Witt says, "64 percent of the students surveyed in the spring 1984 semester rated the program in the top four points." Witt believes there is a growing campus-wide acceptance of the program, and notes that this is the fulfillment of its creation. "The program was not designed to remediate writing deficiences in particular students," he says. "Rather, it was developed to generate awareness on campus of the need for writing proficiency; it helps students take college work more seriously." *N.M.*

For more information, contact Stanley Witt, Writing Department Chairperson, Pima Community College, East Campus, 8202 East Poinciana, AZ 85730. 602/886-3331, ext. 41.

Saint Mary's College

Earning the "W" Signals Proficiency

"Writing is central to all disciplines," says Ann Kimble Loux, thus summing up the philosophy of the Writing Proficiency Program at St. Mary's College, a women's liberal arts school near South Bend, Indiana. Begun in 1972, the program was developed at the same time as a broad curriculum reform effort, and was intended to reflect the college's belief that "the responsibility and the privilege of teaching writing" ought to be distributed across the faculty rather than confined, as in the past, to members of the English department. The result was the creation of the "W requirement," a codified and cross-disciplinary demonstration of competence in college-level writing.

The requirement can be fulfilled in a variety of ways. Although a handful of students are exempted by virtue of high entrance examination scores and successful passage of an essay test, most freshmen find themselves signing up for one of the many *W*-courses offered by several departments (including English). *W*-courses are not simply composition courses; in terms of content they are as pertinent to their disciplines as their non-*W* counterparts. The difference is that students are graded in the usual way on mastery of the content (and collect credit toward general education requirements), but may also "get the *W*" by displaying appropriate coherence, organization, grammar, sentence structure, and complexity of thought in their written work for the course. The two ratings are treated independently; a student may pass a *W*-course yet fail to satisfy the *W* requirement at that time. According to Loux, who directs the program, perhaps 20 to 25 percent of the students need to take a second *W*-course.

The courses are not necessarily limited to a single semester, or even to one discipline. The Department of English, for example, offers all of its *W*-courses in the form of two-semester sequences. Faculty members also experiment extensively with multidisciplinary combinations, called tandems and triads (or troikas), in which the content and assignments are blended and coordinated among instructors from two or three departments. In the past, combinations have included dual courses in English and psychology and English and anthropology; a successful recent troika was offered in philosophy, psychology, and biology. Vice President and Dean of Faculty William Hickey is enthusiastic about these marriages: "They probably represent one of our most successful experiments. The students speak very, very highly of their experiences in the courses, because they reduce the fragmentation and show them how disciplines are in fact related to each other."

As with all writing programs, some of the thorniest problems arise in the judging of "proficiency." St. Mary's has approached the issue through the creation of a body (the Writing Proficiency Committee) and a process (portfolio review). The committee consists of past, current, and future teachers of *W*-courses, about 30 in all, who are recruited by Loux. New members generally serve on the committee for a year before teaching a *W*-course, in order to become familiar with its workings and standards. However, they participate from the start in the portfolio review process.

Essays Submitted for Portfolio Review

The review is the soul of the Writing Proficiency Program, according to Loux. Each student and her W-course teacher collect all the student's written assignments for the course and pick three strong samples: an essay from any point in the term, one from late in the term, and a late in-class essay. All the portfolios from a particular class are gathered together to be reviewed by two other committee members during a single day-long marathon. These readers attempt to reach agreement on ratings for each portfolio, seeking the assistance of additional readers if need be. They then make a recommendation to the teacher, who finally decides to grant or withhold the *W*. Throughout, readers employ a 40-item checklist ("your argument is circular;" "prune unmercifully, you're wordy") which reflects the standards promoted by the committee.

The portfolio review process is "a major intellectual and emotional undertaking," according to a descriptive brochure, which would be "intolerable . . . if it were not so valuable." Its value is not simply as a means of arriving at ratings, but also in its "humanity," says Loux. "So much of writing proficiency certification is done on the basis of a single exam," she says. "Our system is different. I think it gives the student a chance to put forward her best work. It is honest to the writing process, which occurs in a number of different stages."

Twelve years' experience with the Writing Proficiency Program have convinced St. Mary's staff to push ahead with plans to establish an advanced *W* requirement aimed at preparing students to write with the control, sense of context, and sense of audience appropriate to professionals in their chosen disciplines. This development will demand the involvement of more and more faculty over time, particularly those teaching upper-level courses. Dean Hickey is optimistic about securing this cooperation; there are presently more faculty interested in teaching *W*-courses than can be accommodated. "It's absolutely clear," he says, "that this program has increased the concern of faculty about good writing and about the relationship between good writing and learning." *T.P.*

For more information, contact Ann Kimble Loux, Director, Writing Proficiency Program, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, IN 46556. 219/284-4000.

Southeastern Massachusetts University

Writing in the Unified Studies Program

Writing is "absolutely crucial" to Southeastern Massachusetts University's Unified Studies Program (USP), according to Robert Bento, professor of physics. The USP is a semester-long collection of courses that focuses on a single theme, currently the nuclear arms race. First offered in fall 1983, the program includes Freshman Composition, a university re-

quirement for all freshmen, as one of the core courses. One section of this course was devoted entirely to various aspects of the nuclear arms race.

Students write extensively in the composition class, according to Bento. "We try to give students in the USP a coherent approach to writing," he says, "and they develop critical facilities better when they deal in depth with a single topic."

Twelve students were enrolled in the USP during its first offering, and another 12 are enrolled for fall 1984. Bento attributes this small number partly to the fact that the inclusion of the composition course automatically restricts enrollment to freshmen.

In addition to Freshman Composition, the fall 1984 USP includes a physics course—Science, Technology, Society, taught by Bento—and an integrating seminar on the nuclear arms race. The seminar is team-taught by three professors. History of the United States Since 1945 will be offered in spring 1985 instead of Freshman Composition in order to provide a historical context for the issue, says Bento.

The USP students attend the lecture course Science, Technology, Society, in which Bento discusses the technical aspects of the arms race. But "to take that particular component independent of the historical and societal components was previously very frustrating," says Bento. "The question by its very nature cuts across disciplinary lines, and the USP concept satisfies that very well." Because of the large class size, students are required to write only one paper. The USP students, however, may opt to incorporate that paper into a more extensive writing project in the integrating seminar.

Integrating Seminar: The Nuclear Arms Race requires about three papers and a final exam of all USP students. The seminar is team-taught by the three participating professors and is designed to bring together the various elements discussed in the English, history, and physics classes.

"One component of the seminar discusses the use of language in the questions of the nuclear arms race and U.S. defense policy," Bento says. "It looks beyond the superficialities of language and into some of the more subtle ways we can use language to support political positions. We do not pursue this with the depth you would find in a political science class, but it is only one of the topics on which students write."

Freshman Composition to be Dropped from USP

The Unified Studies Program has been modified for the spring 1985 semester. The writing from Freshman Composition will be absorbed into the integrating seminar, thus not restricting the USP to freshmen. "We have already received a fair amount of interest from other students who want to get into the program," says Bento. "Freshmen will still be able to take the USP, but they will have to fulfill the English requirement separately."

Funding for the development and implementation of the program's first two semesters came from SMU's Broad Fields Committee, an internal group comprised primarily of faculty who fund release time for innovative curriculum development. Bento sees the Unified Studies Program eventually becoming one of the components that make up the general education program currently under development at SMU. "This particular USP on nuclear arms may not be offered, but the USP vehicle on a number of different topics may be required of all incoming freshmen," Bento says.

In promoting the program to incoming freshmen, USP faculty members have distributed brochures and placed newspaper articles. "Entering freshmen are generally educationally conservative," says Bento. "They usually do not like to deviate from the standard collection of courses. But the irony is that those who have gone through the program have given extremely positive evaluations, which has led us to open the USP to upperclassmen in the spring. It has been a very satisfying experience." *S.H.*

For more information, contact Robert Bento, Professor of Physics, Southeastern Massachusetts University, North Dartmouth, MA 02747. 617/999-8353.

University of Wisconsin–Madison

Focus on Motivated Students

Only 10 percent of the University of Wisconsin–Madison's 5,000 freshmen are required to take a writing course. This figure represents a dramatic change in the university's approach to teaching writing—prior to 1971 all students completed two composition courses. Initiated by English department faculty, the change reflected their realization that the required courses were not effective because students lacked the motivation to improve their writing, says William T. Lenehen, associate chairperson of the English department. This realization led to a decision to allocate most of their resources to students who wanted help with writing.

"We had no delusions that the 90 percent exempted from English 101 were proficient writers," says Lenehen. A required writing placement test is used only to identify those high risk students who cannot succeed at the university without composition instruction; the 100-item multiple choice test measures reading comprehension and grammar usage.

Taught primarily by graduate assistants, English 101 uses a workshop approach to focus on high risk students' individual problems. Students review grammar and write and revise papers. They do not receive a letter grade for the course but are evaluated on a credit/no credit basis.

The English department reaches out to students exempted from English 101 in several ways. Lenehan calls the writing laboratory, which serves all undergraduates and graduates, the most important effort. Elimination of the composition requirement also has allowed the continuation of the required introductory literature course, which includes writing assignments. In addition, students can enroll in freshman Expository Writing or the upper division Intermediate Composition; the former course is often taken by English 101 graduates who need more writing practice.

Lenehen estimates that about 25 percent of the freshmen, excluding English 101 students, visit the writing laboratory; instructors discourage students from using the laboratory during the semester they take English 101. Developed as the old composition requirement was dropped, the laboratory has grown from one room to four and from three graduate assistants and a part-time director to a full-time director, 3.7 FTE staff members, and 16 graduate assistants.

Writing Lab Addresses Individual Needs

One-to-one tutorials are the laboratory's primary form of instruction. Students visit the laboratory for one-time sessions on specific problems or for weekly small group meetings on more general writing weaknesses. About half of the users are referred by their professors or advisers, according to Lenehan. Instructors in the required introductory literature course often encourage students to visit the laboratory after evaluating diagnostic essays given in the class. Other students come in after learning about the laboratory from peers, student handbooks, or laboratory publicity.

The focus on motivated students has produced "higher morale among composition teachers and a lessening of the administrative load associated with processing 5,000 students through two semesters of composition," says Lenehan. "We still hear faculty bemoaning the illiteracy of the students but no more loudly or frequently than when we had required courses."

Since 1970 administrators have initiated other efforts to ensure graduates' writing competency. The College of Letters and Science requires all departments to certify their seniors' writing

competency. While many automatically certify students who have completed degree requirements, others, such as the physics department, ask instructors to certify students based on knowledge of their writing. On the recommendation of potential employers, the Colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, and Business now offer technical writing courses for their students.

In August 1984 the English department hosted a seminar for faculty members interested in using writing as an instructional tool in various disciplines. *P.A.B.*

For more information, contact William T. Lenehan, Associate Chairperson, Department of English, University of Wisconsin, 600 North Park St., Madison, WI 53706. 608/263-3790.

RESOURCES

Barry, Lois. *The Busy Professor's Travel Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum.* La Grande, Oreg.: Eastern Oregon State College, 1984.

> Believing that "busy professors don't have time to be writing instructors," Barry advises "devising strategies for students to improve their work in progress, rather than dealing with writing disasters after they have occurred." Each chapter introduces one area of concern in the teaching of writing and draws on her own ideas and experiences, those of colleagues, and recent books, articles, and conference presentations. Topics range from why professors do not assign writing and why students do not like to write to using ungraded writing to improve students' learning and responding to students' writing. Although she eschews theory for practical advice, chapter notes and a bibliography offer resources for further study. Single copies available at no charge from Lois Barry, Writing Coordinator, Eastern Oregon State College, 8th and K, La Grande, OR 97850.

Brillhart, L.V. and Debs, M.B. "A Survey of Writing and Technical Writing Courses in Engineering Colleges." *Engineering Education* 74 (November 1983): 110-113.

> The authors attempted to discover the status of technical writing within the undergraduate curricula of U.S. colleges of engineering. "The results of this survey," they report, "indicate administrative support for courses in technical writing. The actual implementation of these courses or of alternate instructional strategies within the engineering schools, however, does not always reflect this support."

Cahir, Stephen. "10 Ways to Improve Writing Skills." *The National Institute of Education Research in Brief*, June 1984.

> This two-page flier lists recommendations based on NIE's research on how to teach writing. Among the advice: include research and brainstorming as part of writing assignments, respond to ideas expressed in a writing assignment, and use writing assignments to help students see that writing can help them in the real world. The staff article from which this advice was drawn and a compendium of NIE writing project abstracts are available from Stephen Cahir, NIE, 1200 19th St., NW, Washington, DC 20208.

Council of Writing Program Administrators, guest editor. *The Forum for Liberal Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, April 1981.

> The council served as guest editor for this issue on comprehensive writing programs, which were defined as "programs that transcend a single department or discipline and that reach out to enhance liberal learning." In the lead essay Harvey Wiener stresses the role of writing in helping students grasp the intricacies of various disciplines. Featured programs include Gonzaga University, Beaver College, Yale University, and Grinnell College. Resources differ from entries in this issue. Single copies available for $3.25 (prepaid) from *Forum*, 1818 R St., N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

Eblen, Charlene. "Writing Across the Curriculum: A Survey of a University Faculty's Views and Classroom Practices." *Research in the Teaching of English* 17 (December 1983): 343-348.

> In her survey of full-time faculty at a middle-sized, midwestern university, Eblen found that respondents, when reviewing students' writings, "assigned a greater degree of importance to overall quality, organization, and development than to the conventions of American English." She noted that the survey "confirms the conclusion of both Klinger and Behrens that nonEnglish faculty share with English faculty a deep concern for student writing."

Fadale, LaVerna M. and Winter, Gene M. *Writing in Postsecondary Occupational Education: Faculty Development Resource Manual.* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York at Albany, 1982.

> This manual describes 16 inservice projects conducted by graduates of the Two-Year College Development Center faculty development program on the teaching of writing. Funded by the New York State Education Department, the SUNY-Albany center sponsors programs for New York postsecondary occupational education instructors. Campus teams complete a three-day workshop and implement in-service activities on their own campuses. Programs are based on the belief that writing skills are critical to both academic and career success. The manual includes sample assignments and faculty surveys. A photocopy of the manual is available for $10 from LaVerna Fadale, Project Director, Two-Year College Development Center, SUNY-Albany, Draper 306, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, NY 12222. 518/455-8271.

Fagan, Edward R. "Language as Educational Art." *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Language in School and Society.* East Lansing, Mich.: Department of English, Michigan State University, forthcoming.

> Calling language a linguistic paradox, Fagan writes that today's English teachers must teach the positive and negative power of language and link language with human survival. A professor of language education at Pennsylvania State University, Fagan offers several examples of language as an educational act (Helen Keller's discovery of the meaning of the word *water*). He advises teachers to integrate decision making, problem solving, reflective thinking, choosing priorities, analyzing data, and processing a myriad of linguistic information into students' language study.

Foster, David. *A Primer for Writing Teachers.* Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1983.

> "This is not a book about what to do Monday in the classroom," warns Foster. He reviews linguistic theories, explores the relationship between nonstandard English and literacy, and describes audience, setting, and purpose as important variables in judging language appropriateness. Despite his disclaimers, Foster's chapters on Planning the Course and Teaching the Course offer advice and practical "food for thought."

Held, George, and Rosenberg, Warren. "Student-Faculty Collaboration in Teaching College Writing." *College English* 45 (December 1983): 817-823.

> The authors describe a program developed at Queens College which brings together teams of faculty members and undergraduates, selected on the basis of their writing skills and motivation levels, to teach composition to undergraduate students. Held and Rosenberg stress the importance of power decentralization in the teaching of writing, and state that "by bringing into the classroom advanced student writers as team teachers and by treating them as true collaborators, we have altered the traditional power structure." From diverse comments made about their work by their instructors, say the authors, students will realize that "writing is largely a matter of options among which the writer is free to choose."

Hennings, Dorothy Grant. "Words Processed Here—Write with Your Computer." *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (October 1983): 122-124.

> Because word processors make the writing process faster and easier, observes Hennings, they encourage more revision and thus lead to improvement in the quality of writing. She briefly describes the

parts of a microcomputer's word processing system, providing a good outline for beginning users. Advocating the benefits computer use can yield to school writing programs, Hennings states: "At a time when computers are being purchased for school use, especially in mathematics and science programs, educators should not overlook their potential as a writing tool."

Huff, Roland K. "Teaching Revision: A Model of the Drafting Process." *College English* 45 (December 1983): 800-816.

Huff states that: "Immature writers need to be provided with a model of the drafting process that teaches them how to construct text in response to the evolving definition of an increasingly rich and specifically designed rhetorical problem." The model he describes has three stages: zero-drafting—the discovery and initial realization of the topic; problem-solving drafting—the identification and resolution of major conceptual and organizational problems; and final drafting—the attempt to arrive at the best possible solution of a rhetorical problem.

The Institute on Writing. The University of Iowa, 308 English-Philosophy Building, Iowa City, IA 52242. 319/353-6559 or 353-5650. Carl H. Klaus, Director.

Established in 1977 with a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the institute is committed to improving the teaching of writing at colleges and universities across the country. In 1979 and 1980 it assisted 42 writing program directors from state and private institutions in the preparation of model freshman writing courses and faculty development activities for their campuses; these directors form the institute's network of writing program professionals who conduct workshops on the teaching of writing. A 1984 essay collection, *Courses for Change in Writing, A Selection From the NEH/Iowa Institute*, illustrates the variety of approaches implemented by network members and details 16 distinctive courses, including assignments (available for $7.60, net, from Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 860, Upper Montclair, NY 07043). Persons interested in contracting for staff or network members to conduct faculty development workshops on writing across the disciplines should contact institute Director Carl Klaus.

Judy, Stephen N. and Judy, Susan J. *An Introduction to the Teaching of Writing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.

This useful book begins with 5 basic assumptions: writing is a liberal art, writing is taught as a process, writing is a learn-by-doing skill, writing experiences should be authentic, evaluation and criticism should be given in practice. Translating these principles into action, the authors offer commentary and recommendations on such topics as the writing process, assignments, editing, and grading.

Lamb, Catherine E. "Initiating Change as a Writing Consultant," *College English* 45 (March 1983;: 296-300.

Writing on her experiences as a writing consultant at Albion College during 1980-81, Lamb states that her main goals were to make faculty members understand that "writing can be used as a primary mode of learning in a course, not merely to test whether or not course objectives have been achieved; and writing can serve these learning functions only if it is used in a continuing systematic way throughout a course." To encourage commitment to writing at the college, Lamb held workshops, developed an *Albion College Style Sheet*—a summary of American Psychological Association (APA) and Modern Language Association (MLA) style formats, and met continually with faculty members on an informal basis to discuss both their own and students' writing. The author notes that no faculty member was obligated to make use of her services; achieving her goals "depended on my continuing efforts to convince people of the value of what I was doing."

Leahy, Ellen K. "A Writing Teacher's Shopping and Reading List for Software." *English Journal* 73 (January 1984): 62-65.

Leahy describes various types of writing programs such as drill and practice, tutorials, word processing and writing assistance, and lists a variety of software packages and where to obtain them. She cautions that all software "should be reviewed and evaluated with the intention of documenting other educational objectives that can be attained."

Maimon, Elaine P.; Belcher, Gerald L.; Hearn, Gail W.; Nodine, Barbara F.; and O'Connor, Finbarr W. *Writing in the Arts and Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1981.

"Writing and learning are connected interactive processes" is one of the principles that shape this valuable textbook for college students interested in the process of thinking, researching, and writing in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Topics range from preparing laboratory reports and research papers to writing notes from lectures, discussions, and texts. Chapters describe the writing styles appropriate to various fields and include review questions and exercises.

Murray, Donald M. "Writing and Teaching for Surprise." *College English* 46 (January 1984): 1-7.

"Students become writers at the moment when they first write what they do not expect to write. They experience the moment of surprise that motivates writers to haul themselves to their writing desks year after year," writes Murray. He maintains that surprise is the event that leads writers on in their creation and helps them find larger meaning in their work. Students must learn to expect, accept, and cultivate surprises in their writing, he says, and teachers must be aware of these events in their own writing as well as in the writings of their students, and encourage them.

National Writing Project. School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720. 415/642-0963. James Gray, Director.

In 1977 the Bay Area Writing Project at UC–Berkeley became the parent site for the National Writing Project (NWP). NWP employs the Bay Area project's approach of bringing together elementary, secondary, and college instructors to work on the teaching of writing. It has established 121 national sites that offer inservice courses on the teaching of writing to 70,000 teachers annually. Among NWP's guiding principles are "teachers must practice the skills they teach" and "teachers do not know much about writing—because it is not usually taught in college—but are eager to learn about it." NWP publications include the *NWP Evaluation Portfolio*, an assessment of the project's impact on the teaching and learning of writing at various NWP sites, and thematic series on peer response and writing to learn. Persons interested in establishing new sites should contact NWP Director James Gray.

Olson, Gary A., ed. *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1984.

Writing specialists have contributed 19 essays to this volume's sections on the pedagogical issues underlying college writing centers, center administration, and such special concerns as foreign students' needs. "Writing centers are coming of age," declares Thom Hawkins in the introduction, ". . . (yet) there has been no extensive documentation of their impact." Authors discuss the results of the first generation of thinking and research on writing centers and share insights from their own experiences. Topics include peer tutoring, how centers promote cognitive development, establishing and funding a center, and dealing with attitudinal problems of students and faculty members. Available for $15.50 ($12 for NCTE members) from NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801.

Rodrigues, Raymond J. "The Computer-Based Writing Program from Loan to Print." *English Journal* 73 (January 1984): 27-31.

Rodrigues observes that "within the past two years . . . composition instructors around the country have been developing interactive computer programs to lead students through the entire writing process, prewriting through editing." Discussing the benefits of computer-assisted writing instruction, he notes that when students use computers to write and edit, tasks become faster and easier to complete. In the prewriting phase, computer programs can help students generate ideas to write about and structure those ideas. Students using word processing find draft writing and rewriting less arduous, the computer relieving them of the time consuming process of handcopying or retyping whole drafts to produce a final product. In the editing phase, programs can be used to analyze the students' writing through a number of subprograms that check such facets of a writing piece as spelling, punctuation, number of *be* verbs per sentence, and number of abstract nouns per sentence.

Schwartz, Mimi. "Response to Writing: A College-Wide Perspective." *College English* 46 (January 1984): 55-62.

Schwartz describes an interdisciplinary survey that examined and compared those rhetorical values which influence faculty members and students' assessment of writing. She noted that the criteria upon which 22 faculty members based their assessments of good writing were not the same criteria that 105 students *thought* their teachers used. Schwartz says that there seemed to be "little match between what faculty want in writing and what students think we want. Whereas our rhetorical values as readers shift with the writing context—depending on perceptions of audience, purpose, style, and content—our students' rhetorical values as writers seem to stay the same: Use big words to be impressive, write more to be intelligent, be impersonal to be logical, use correct punctuation to be mature." She urges teachers to explain their rhetorical values to their students, making sure students understand that these values exist "not as universally-agreed-upon standards, but rather as personal and professional assessments that vary with our reading agenda."

Selfe, Cynthia L. and Arbabi, Freydoon. "Writing to Learn: Engineering Student Journals." *Engineering Education* 74 (November 1983): 86-90.

This article reports on an experiment in which 35 students in a section of a Michigan Technological University lecture class, Structural Analysis and Design, were asked to write at least one page a week in personal journals. The students were instructed to write about topics relating to their coursework. The authors found that the students, through concentration on and organization of facts and questions that the writing process necessitated, "came to realize that their journals could help them learn and understand technical content." The students also discovered that their journals allowed them to communicate more personally and completely their thoughts, questions, and suggestions about coursework and assignments to their instructor. The authors noted that: "With few exceptions, the section that had written journals submitted projects with more coherent, organized and complete explanations of the design process than those of the control group."

Tebeaux, Elizabeth. "Keeping Technical Writing Relevant (Or, How to Become a Dictator)." *College English* 45 (February 1983):174-183.

Tebeaux says that technical writing courses must take into account the ways in which information is disseminated; students must have dictation skills because that is now the method by which documents can be most quickly and efficiently originated. Dictating, notes the author, helps students to recognize awkward tone and structure, eliminate "businessese," write in active voice, and overcome writing blocks.

Wiener, Harvey S. *The Writing Room*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Wiener offers a nitty-gritty guide to improving remedial writers' skills. He answers the question "how much may beginning writers reasonably achieve in typical classroom instruction within a term's work?" and provides detailed advice on tests, assignments, grammar, and using the paragraph as a teaching tool.

Witte, Stephen P. and Faigley, Lester. *Evaluating College Writing Programs*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

Evaluating composition programs is more than reviewing student progress, claim the authors. Evaluators should use several approaches and consider the interaction of the program's cultural and social context, institutional context, structure and administration, content or curriculum, and instruction. They might ask such questions as "does the writing program send students into the world better able to adapt the process and products of writing to novel situations?" and "does what a student learns in a writing course affect performance in subsequent courses?"

Wresch, William. "Computers and Composition Instruction: An Update." *College English* 45 (December 1983): 794-799.

Wresch applauds the development of computer programs which teach writing skills, and describes some of the noteworthy among these. Programs include the following: a pre-writing program at Oakland University, which has two parts: one in which students respond to the computer, and the other in which students use the computer to respond to each other. Writer's Workbench, a program originally developed by Bell Laboratories for use by technical writers. It is a collection of thirty related programs which serve as proofreaders for certain common errors, give stylistic analyses, and suggest improvements where needed. WANDAH ((Writers' and Authors' Helper), a whole-process program created by Ruth Von Blum, which includes a word processor, a set of programs to encourage pre-writing, and a set of programs to help in revising. Wordsworth II, developed by Cynthia Selfe, is a program divided into eight modules, each of which attempts to help students with a specific writing objective. Wresch's own program Essaywriter, writes a rough draft for the student.

"The Write Course: An Introduction to College Composition."

"The Write Course" is a 30-part telecourse in freshman composition. It illustrates the problems confronting student and professional writers by dramatizing the experiences of a video company which is designing an English composition telecourse. Introduced in fall 1984, the public television series emphasizes writing as a process, including such activities as shaping a thesis, drafting, and editing. Videocassettes of the series are available. The course was produced by the Dallas County Community College District with funding from The Annenberg/CPB Project. For more information, contact The Annenberg/CPB Collection, "The Write Course," 1213 Wilmette Ave., Wilmette, IL 60091. 800/532-7637 (312/256-3200 in Illinois).

Forum Wins Second Edpress Award

For the second year in a row, a *Forum* essay has received the editorial award from the Washington Educational Press Association. The 1984 winner was Robert C. Williams' "Sounds of Silence: The Academy and the Nuclear Question," which was the lead essay in the March 1983 *Forum* issue on peace studies. Last year's winner was the October 1982 *Forum* essay by F. James Rutherford: "Sputnik, Halley's Comet, and Science Education." Copies of these issues are available for $3.25 each from the *Forum* office.

Forum Editorial Policy

The Forum for Libral Education focuses on a topic of importance to the higher education community in each issue. It does not endorse or evaluate programs but rather describes the ways in which colleges and universities are addressing common concerns. The staff is interested in learning about your activities. If your program is chosen for inclusion in an issue a staff member will interview a contact person at your school and write the article. Future issues will examine

- lifelong learning, especially humanities programs directed at the business community
- liberal learning with a civic purpose
- evaluating recently-revised general education programs

If you would like your activities considered for inclusion in an upcoming issue, please contact Peggy Ann Brown, *Forum* Editor, AAC, 1818 R St., N.W., Washington, DC 20009. 202/387-3760, ext. 30.